DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 459 UD 029 769

AUTHOR Deever, Bryan
TITLE The Panopticon of Tracking: Desegregation and Curriculum Change in a Southern School, 1968-1972.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History (Chicago, IL, April 2, 1991). For a related document, see ED 367 749.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Curriculum Development; *Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Litigation; Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Federal Legislation; Political Power; Power Structure; Public Schools; Racially Balanced Schools; *School Desegregation; Social Change; Social Structure; *Track System (Education)
IDENTIFIERS *Bulloch County Public Schools GA; Foucault (Michel); United States (South)

ABSTRACT

As integration was enacted under federal mandate in Georgia in 1969, a number of parallel curricular changes were made. This paper examines those changes and the accompanying discursive practices that were produced in the context of school integration. Using a postmodern conception of power and the tactics of power based on the writing of Michel Foucault, it is argued that desegregation was not accomplished: segregation was simply reinvested in a more diffuse and subtle form within the public school system. The postmodern conception of power as a complex web operating around and through all social relations is illustrated in the changes that replaced segregation through isolation with segregation through curriculum change. The panopticon, the prison structure in which prisoners were in full view of the supervisor but could not see each other, serves as a metaphor for the redistribution of power throughout the parts of institutions. The experiences in the Bulloch County schools demonstrate the tracking of students and inequitable treatment of black faculty, and those actions served to perpetuate the old order through ability grouping that became segregation. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 459

The Panopticon of Tracking: Desegregation and Curriculum Change in a Southern School, 1968-1972

Bryan Deever, Ph.D.
Georgia Southern University

Paper Presented at Annual Meeting of The Society for the Study of Curriculum History
April 2, 1991
Chicago, Illinois.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bryan Deever
Georgia Southern Univ.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

In the public schools of the state of Georgia, as in many public school systems in the deep South, the articulation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was circumvented and resisted for a number of years utilizing a discourse of "free choice." Following a court action initiated by the United States Department of Justice in 1969, the public schools of Bulloch county were ordered to desegregate "immediately and without further delay." As integration was enacted there were a number of parallel curricular reforms within the county schools. This paper examines those changes and the accompanying discursive practices which were produced within the context of school integration. Utilizing a postmodern conception of power and the tactics of power, this paper interrogates those reforms and the supporting public discourse generated around educational issues and argues that desegregation was not accomplished but rather segregation was re-invested in a more diffuse and subtle form within the public school system.

It is my intention (in the spirit of Nietzsche and Foucault) to embed this investigation of power and modality within the text of an historical study. My working definition of power relations is derived from the writing of Michel Foucault. I posit that power must be examined through the modalities by which it is articulated. The power relation considered in this study is the relationship between the black and white communities in the public schools of a isolated, rural county in southeast Georgia.

It must be understood that the schools were part of the social milieu in which blacks and whites existed within a particular relation of power. When the schools were forced to relinquish the external form

of separation and fragmentation, a new mode developed to perpetuate an articulation of that extant relation of power. I will begin with a discussion of power and a postmodern conception of curriculum.

I. Power Relations, Modes of Articulation, and Curriculum

> Relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships, but are immanent in the latter; they are the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums which occur in the latter, and conversely they are the internal conditions of these differentiations . . . they have a directly productive role whenever they come into play.[1]

Postmodern conceptions of power posit that it is neither linear nor subjective but rather the complex web operating around and through all social relations.[2] To examine social relations is to examine the ways in which power operates; how the subject is materially constituted through relations of power. This paper draws on certain assumptions from which we may paraphrase an analysis of power and relations of power.

Power exists within the social body, there is no escape from power within the social network. In this sense power is not a thing to be externally administered or applied but rather something which is interwoven within all social relations. Therefore all social relations are also relations of power and it is impossible to remove oneself from the effects of power. Power is not a constant but rather exists as a force which simultaneously is defined through its articulations and shapes the social actor who is engaged in that exercise of power.

Power relations are not merely prohibitive but take multiple forms. Power is interconnected. Power is to be understood not by its outcomes but by its application. Power is not inherently oppressive (although it

may be articulated oppressively) nor is it objective (because any relation of power will be an asymmetrical relationship).

Power relations are a multiform production and cannot be reduced merely to the 'dominator' and the 'dominated.' In this sense power must be understood not as a binary structure but as a web of relations which may be partially susceptible to integration into various strategies of domination or liberation. Hence, power relations serve, but only because they are capable of being used strategically, not as the result of some inherent of primacy of force. As discussed above, power exists in all social relationships; therefore power is not produced as an offshoot of a particular set of interests but rather may be utilized strategically to perpetuate a particular set of interests.

There are no relations of power without the simultaneous existence of resistance. Resistance is formed at the very point in which power is exercised but must not be seen as a secondary force doomed to failure. Rather its co-existence with power grants it the same possibilities for integration into strategies and applications.[3]

Within these assumptions we generate a concept of power which is not limited to the mere linear application of force. Power is no longer a passive potential which may be granted or taken, given or exchanged; rather it is a force which exists only in action. The questions we must ask are not why certain people seek to dominate or what their motives are. Rather let us consider that when power is exercised, what does that involve? What are its mechanisms and modes of articulation?[4]

The fact that power exists in all social relations is not to say that it is always exercised. There must exist some mode for the articulation of power, some means through which relations of power might

be asserted. These modes of articulation, however, are not directly tied to a particular relation of power. It is quite possible for a set of power relations to be articulated through a variety of modes and the diffusion of a particular mode does not guarantee the diffusion of a particular set of power relations. In other words, to strip a social actor of a mode of articulation does nothing to alter the actor's original intentions in the use of that strategy.

Such is the case in this study. Although some may argue that integration diffused or even eliminated the asymmetrical power relationship between the black and white communities in the educational setting, the application of previously discussed conceptions of power rebuke that assertion. Upon this terrain of meaning, power is present in all social relations and the applications of power are multivarious. Therefore relations of power never disappear, they may simply assume a new mode of articulation. In this case, segregation (a relation of power) by isolation was replaced with segregation by through curriculum change. It will be shown that the power relations existing in the schools after integration were of the same type existing before integration; only the mode of articulation was different. This application of power within the integrated school may be thought of as "panopticism," or panoptic power.[5]

Within the architectural articulation of the panoptic concept (developed by Jeremy Bentham in 1843 as an ideal form of incarceration), a large tower was to be ringed with a multilevel building containing individual cells that were open only toward the central structure; prisoners were constantly in full view of the supervisor, but not each other. For each prisoner there existed a visibility of the central

tower alongside a lateral invisibility. This lateral invisibility was the guarantee of order.[6] "Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power."[7]

The concept of the Panopticon is not utilized in a literal sense in this study, just as Foucault did not intend for a literal translation in its relationship to the applications of power. What the Panopticon represents is a metaphor for a redistribution of power throughout all parts of an institution. Power that exists not only in clearly defined, linear subjectivities, but is also embedded in the relations themselves and the discourse used to define, explain, and articulate those relations. As opposed to control through isolation (i.e. the dungeon, or segregation), the Panopticon produced isolation through surveillance. Rituals of exclusion were replaced by rituals of confinement.

> Confinement . . . gave rise to disciplinary projects. Rather than the massive, binary division between one set of people and another, it called for multiple separations, individualizing distributions, an organization in depth of surveillance and control, an intensification and a ramification of power.[8]

The difference is separation and segmentation; the first is marked, the second is analyzed and distributed. The results are still the same in terms of the exercision of power; "They are different projects, then, but not incompatible ones."[9] The effect of the Panopticon was to remove power from its position external to the individual and as an application of force, and instead invest power into the functions of everyday life. In effect power is not applied to alter functions, power is now articulated through the functions: ". . . power relations function in a function. . ."[10]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The manner in which this panoptic power was visited upon the integrated schools is to be found in the curricular changes which were initiated following desegregation. This study utilizes a conception of curriculum which is broader that the structural notion of curriculum as content material.

Curriculum must be understood to be the entire 'text' of schooling which includes both the formal and informal course content, the schooling of the body through enforced social relations, and the presentation of 'acceptable' hierarchical social relationships. The term 'text' must be understood as more than merely printed words; it must also include all the visual and aural presentations occurring within the school setting every day. The curriculum as text, then, provides a much wider landscape from which to interrogate the entire range of effect that public schooling has upon the constituent body.

To investigate curriculum change is to interrogate more than simply the alteration of the content and arrangement of courses. It demands we consider the grouping of students, the spatial arrangements of students within the school proper, the physical location of teachers and administrators in relation to students and their colleagues, and the discourse of assumptions which inform the day-to-day realities of classroom life. To study curriculum change is to consider the entire range of messages being simultaneously transmitted at the students and the staff. These messages are the modes through which certain relations of power are articulated, defined, and maintained.

Within this terrain of meaning, curricular reform may be understood as an articulation of a new modality of power within the educational setting; a modality which may enable the coercion and oppression of

individuals to continue within the larger structural framework. This modality of power is neither a direct extension of the law/political structures nor an independent expression but rather an articulation of the tactics of power which "characterize, classify, specialize . . . and hierarchize individuals in relation to one another and, if necessary, disqualify and invalidate" within the larger framework of liberation and equality of opportunity.[11]

II. Maintaining The Old

Students and parents were informed in the May 1, 1969 edition of The Bulloch Herald and the Bulloch Times that school designation forms for the coming academic year were to be filed by the end of the month with the school of the student's choice. It was stated that the filing of these forms was to "enable the administration of all elementary and high schools in Bulloch County to provide each student a high quality education in a lawful, orderly, and efficient manner,"[12] but if these selections resulted in overcrowded conditions, students would be re-assigned at the county's discretion. Thus was the state of segregated schooling in this rural county in southeastern Georgia at the beginning of the decade of the 1970's; clearly defined boundaries demarcated the white and the black social communities and particularly in the arena of public education.

That spring the five county high schools were set to graduate 431 seniors from the segregated campuses of Marvin Pittman, Portal, Southeast Bulloch, Statesboro, and William James High Schools. Of the five schools, William James was the "negro" institution and served all the African-American students in a county containing a black population of nearly forty percent. Although the county sustained de facto

segregation, the 'freedom of choice' plan was designed to remove the responsibility for segregation from the school officials and place it upon the parents. As such, it was argued, it was the local choice of the parents to continue the separation of the community, not the policy of the school board.

In the same issue as the announcement of graduation plans was a short notice that the trial of the Department of Justice suit against the Bulloch County Board of Education would be heard in the neighboring county seat of Swainsboro on Tuesday, June 3, at 10:00 a.m. In a masthead article the previous week, the positions of the protagonist parties were explained with the government holding that "Bulloch County has a dual school system based on race, and the defense being there is but one system where in each student attends his chosen school without prejudice."[13] However, the United States Attorney General charged that Bulloch County had maintained a dual school system based on race in spite of the adoption of the freedom-of-choice plan in 1965 and that the six facilities for blacks were inferior in every way to the ten schools for whites in the county. Citing failure to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, United States District Judge Alexander A. Lawrence ordered the county school board to develop an acceptable form of operation "conformable to the requirements of the constitution in this action" within the next thirty days.[14] Failure to do so would result in the interdiction of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the planning process and a continuation of the loss of federal funds which had been terminated in December, 1968 when the suit was initially brought against the school board.

When the July 10 deadline arrived, the county school board was still holding to the position that their "School Designation System" was satisfactory to the local needs and cited "a very substantial increase of children departing former Negro schools [and] entering predominately white schools."[15] In an extended statement the Bulloch County officials contended that

> the School Designation System fills the true legal requirement of "just school for people, now" and it is [our] belief that it was and is the best plan which could be devised, for it made all schools and school facilities available to all children without regard to race or record of race or previous schools attended, and put within reach of each of these young citizens the means of real individual freedom, and the opportunity to be educated where he or she would best be suited, without dictation or coercion, and free from discrimination and fear.[16]

What was not discussed by the school board were the continual tactics of harassment against families of color who attempted to take advantage of this 'freedom of choice' option in education. According to Patrick Jones, president of the Bulloch County Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People there was a regular pattern of pressure to control blacks who desired to enter white schools.

> Some landlords told Negro parents they would have to move if they sent their children to the "white" school. Some employers told Negro parents they would lose their jobs if they sent their children to the "white" school. Some told Negros their loans would be foreclosed if they sent their children to "white" schools. . . . The freedom of choice plan did not work and there are many reasons why it did not work. It didn't work because people wouldn't help it work. Instead they worked to keep it from working.[17]

A few black parents did choose to resist and send their children to the white schools. The interview of an informant who was a tenth grade student in 1966 also gives us a sense of the relatively small impact those students made in terms of integration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q. Were there black students who took advantage of the 'freedom of choice' plan at Statesboro High School?
I. Yes. We did have in our high school probably, well, for instance in my class we had six sections of students. And I would say in the entire class we probably had six students who came in with me that year. . . . Let's see, we probably had thirty in each section and there were six sections, so we had one hundred eighty. Maybe a little less that say one hundred seventy-five. So we had six. They were students in the school that were very sharp and were very aggressive. They had to, almost, because they were taking a big risk to be in a class that big and be the only one or two.
Q. So it was a risk?
I. It was a big, huge risk, yes.[18]

Representatives from HEW also disagreed with the effectiveness of the school designation system and forwarded their own plan for re-assigning grade levels within the existing county schools, re-districting the county, and closing and renovating the dilapidated William James facility as well as integrating black and white faculty in the public schools. This plan was rejected outright by the county board who held to their position of "Freedom of Choice."

On Friday, July 18, while the temperature hovered around the one hundred degree mark, the parties again met with Judge Lawrence in Savannah. At this time the judge ruled that proposals presented by both the Justice Department and the Board of Education were inadequate and imposed his own nine point plan to achieve compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

1. Establishment of four high schools to serve Statesboro and the remainder of the county divided into the north, the middle and the south.
2. Conversion of William James to a county-wide vocational high school.
3. The establishment of one elementary school to serve the northerly area of the county.
4. The establishment of three elementary schools to serve the south of the county.
5. The establishment of four elementary schools in Statesboro for the middle regions of the county.
6. The continuation of one junior high school in Statesboro.
7. Discontinuance in the use of the three "negro" elementary schools.
8. Desegregated school facilities including lunch rooms, restrooms, and locker rooms.

9. Transfer allowance to another school for participation in sports, music and special studies not available in one's own school.[19]

In addition, the school board was ordered to report back to the court by October 15 as to the results of the plan concerning "numbers of negroes and whites in student bodies and faculties of each school (BH July 19, 1969)." In the eyes of the political system, the matter was settled.

Public resistance to these events was beginning to form as white parents met in independent sessions to consider their course of action. Throughout this period they had been exploring options for circumventing the court ordered desegregation guidelines. Following Judge Lawrence's mid-July refusal to delay integration, a local white citizen's committee called "Citizens for Better Government" (CBG) was formed. The same evening that the board rejected the HEW proposal, Georgia Governor Lester G. Maddox addressed a standing room only rally sponsored by the committee in the Statesboro High School gymnasium. His impassioned remarks cut to what many believed to be the heart of the desegregation debate in Bulloch County.

> School desegregation is part of the Communist plan to overthrow this country. They are destroying America through sex education and not letting teachers pray and read the Bible. Some teachers are being stabbed in their classrooms. Has it happened here? It has happened in Atlanta. That is the legacy of desegregation. Voters should defeat every bond issue for water, sewerage, streets, and schools until local and state officials join in the fight to save America.[20]

Apparently inspired by Maddox's support, the Citizens for Better Government published a resolution on the schools wherein they stated, among other beliefs, that

> the people of our nation have been bombarded with propaganda by the national radio, television, and newspapers; by the universities and other educational institutions; by groups dedicated to the overthrow of our government; by liberal politicians from the Office of the President of The United States down through Congress and State Governors, and even The Supreme Court and judiciary of our country so as to attempt to create hatred and turmoil among the races, and contempt for law and order. Now be

> it therefore resolved, the Representative Committee of The Citizens For Better Government . . . hereby respectfully announce their opposition to the proposed plan for the forced integration of the races in our public school system.[21]

On August 14 the school officials wrote an open message to the people of Bulloch County which was printed in The Bulloch Herald. The text contained a recapitulation of their position for "Freedom of Choice" and the subsequent refusal of both the federal government and its courts to "allow local people or local officials any choice." Positioning themselves as the innocent victims of a federal government which was regulating desegregation "with the same amount of power it regulates the Federal income tax, the Federal highways, the Federal Agriculture Program, the Federal Defense Department, the Post Office Department, and all other Federal activities," the members of the school board stated their intent to acquiesce to the requirements of the law while simultaneously striving to gain relief from "Federal compulsion in our schools." They stated their resolve to continue to serve the children of Bulloch County and urged reasonable compliance from the members of the community so as not to provide "subversives and World Communism the delight if any of our children get uneducated." The letter closed with the following prayerful statement:

> Before God and our Country we say these things to all of our citizens of good will; we ask these special considerations by you, the public; and our prayer is that light will come, and that in days ahead we shall find answers that will make ours a better land under the watch-care of the Father of us all.[22]

One week later there appeared a point-counterpoint of open letters involving the school board and the citizens' committee; in this exchange an open rupture became evident around the issue of resistance. Both groups began by reaffirming their desire to work cooperatively with one another and expressed appreciation for each group's efforts toward

maintaining peace and lawful activities. The balance of the school board text was devoted to recapitulating the position that the county and the board had been systematically and unjustly forced away from its established policy of "Freedom of Choice" and into enforced desegregation by an overwhelmingly powerful Federal government and that resistance was, at this point, futile. The officials of the CBG took special note of this tone and issued a thinly veiled warning.

> We, as officials of "The Citizens For Better Government," feel that portions of this message and portions of the letter sent to us and published in another part of this paper, is not in good taste and ill received by a large number of people in our county. We pray that our school officials will, "In a spirit of cooperation," refrain from publishing any more "messages" which might be construed as intimidating to the citizenry. On this particular subject, we will say no more.[23]

This exchange clearly marks the divergence of the school board and the citizens' committee over the continued use of the old mode of articulation. The board, recognizing the position the government held in terms of funding, was about to capitulate to the demands of the Justice Department. The CBG, however, sought other means to continue to racial segregation through the separation of black and white students. To that end, there began a series of attempts to build private academies in the Statesboro area which was culminated in 1971 with the opening of the Bulloch Academy, a segregationist school built and supported by various economic and political elites from the white community.

Throughout the summer the school board moved through the actions of implementing the court ordered plan for integration. However, on August 27, 1969 the board unanimously to postpone the opening of the county schools from September 2 to September 8. The rationale was twofold: (1) the board found it impossible to complete the administrative and physical changes "including moving furniture from one school to another,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

determining [the] instructional equipment, books, and supplies to be shifted from one school to another and remodeling some schools to handle larger student populations;" and (2) the board requested that Judge Lawrence dissolve the court ordered desegregation plan "against Bulloch County" while a Federal suit against the state education system of Georgia, filed earlier that month, was in litigation.[24] Lawrence refused, and the schools opened on September 8, 1969, under the watchful eyes of the federal government.

The struggle in the white community by both the school board and the CBG may be understood as a struggle to maintain the old modality of articulation. This was not necessarily a fight to maintain white dominance over the black community within the schools, but to maintain a particular articulation of that relation of power. The actual integration of the schools negated that old modality and made it necessary to construct some new way to exercise power.

The school board, after the final attempt to dissolve the court order, appeared to accept the disappearance of the old mode. The CBG, however, continued to work to preserve that mode through the formation of private segregated schools to replace the public segregated schools. The fact that this was a small effort and resulted in a single segregation academy is irrelevant to the argument that this was an attempt to preserve a particular mode of articulation.

When the school board found it impossible to continue the old mode, it became necessary to construct a new mode to maintain the extant power relation between the black and white community in the public schools. If it were not possible to keep the black and white students separated in different school buildings, then a way must be developed to keep them

In relatively separate classrooms. The integration of black faculty must also be done in such a way as to minimize their contact with white students. But not all white students; the upper level students were the ones who were seen to be most in need of isolation while the lower level students were seen by the administration as 'expendable.' This is witnessed by the initial assignments of black faculty in the elementary schools and the relegation of black principals to assistant positions. The development of this new panoptic modality and its institution through curriculum change is discussed in the following section of this paper.

> Q. So you were student teaching during the last year of the 'freedom of choice' plan, and then started teaching full time during the first year of court ordered integration, when the court said . . .
> I. You will totally integrate. And the way they chose to do that, well, they had a real problem.[25]

The school board, although publicly maintaining their desire to return to 'freedom of choice,' had essentially succumbed to the federal government. However, most of the integration was occurring outside of Statesboro proper in the surrounding elementary schools. In the northern district, one hundred eighty black elementary children were bussed to the middle area in Statesboro and placed in temporary rooms along with fifty elementary students from the southern district; meanwhile, no 'adjustments' were being made at any of the high schools. Black students were being moved to white schools, traditional black facilities were systematically being shut down, and black faculty and administrators were being transferred to white facilities. On the surface, integration seemed to progressing according to plan with little or no tension within the educational community.

> Reports county-wide showed there have been no incidents of violence at any school whatever; student behavior has been good; and the officials complimented the students of Bulloch County for their good order and cooperation.
> Groups of white and black Bulloch County patrons have spoken up for the Board of Education in the Board's stand for good order and against violence and handling by legal means of any white or black who causes or attempts injury or harm in any school.[26]

However, the manner in which the blacks were being integrated, especially the faculty, illuminates a different perspective. An informant who was a first year, second grade teacher at Sallie Zetterower Elementary during this period offered insight into the inequitable treatment of black faculty.

> Q. So how did it [the integration of faculty] work out?
> I. Well the initial part of the year was really hectic; as we worked through the year I think it went pretty well. . . . But you had teachers who traditionally had classrooms of their own [in the black schools] who were moved into . . . I taught with a woman who was a veteran teacher in junior high, I was a first year teacher and I had my classroom; she came in and they gave her the job of being a rotating teacher. In all the second grade she was going to teach all the social studies. So she had her little packet of materials and she went from room, to room, to room; and just about every black teacher they brought over, either they gave them some Title I setting, or they made them rotating teachers, or something like that. Very few of them had a permanent classroom.
> Q. What happened to the black principals?
> I. They became assistant principals. They were all shifted to assistant principalships. So it was almost like [pause] they were put into situations where they would have almost as little impact as possible. The impression I got was that there was a great fear, of school system people, of private education taking over and pulling out a great number of white students. . . . My perception, as a first year teacher looking at where I was placed and where others were placed, was that black teachers were put in positions where they would probably have the least contact with white students.[27]

Several of this veteran teacher's perceptions appear to be correct. Within two years, the black teaching force had been reduced from eighty-five to forty-four; over half the black teaching force was assigned to Title I positions which were federally funded and susceptible to termination if the government found the integration process to be unacceptable; two of the three black principals who remained in the county were demoted; and the entire composition of the school board, the central office, and the P.T.A. was still white.[28]

Even the physical state of the black children who were now sharing classrooms with white children was a jarring revelation as members of the white community were now forced to deal, face to face, with the intense material discrepancies between the two social groups.

> The only black students I had ever been around were . . . very similar in culture to me. Where the massive numbers were from very low socio-economic situations. I was dealing with children who came into school with rat bites all over them, and with their heads shaved because they had lice, you know, so it was very shocking to me because I had never been around anything like that.[29]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Meanwhile, the CBG was still struggling to maintain the old mode of articulation. At a Citizens for Better Government rally, shortly after classes had begun, over nine hundred persons were informed of the concerns of some parents.

> The group also listened to reports from parents who are not satisfied with the present school operation. Some of the complaints were as follows:
> 1. Insults and threats directed at white students by negro students.
> 2. Overcrowding of classrooms.
> 3. Unsanitary bathrooms.
> 4. Lack of textbooks.
> 5. Lack of discipline.
> 6. Abuse of "Free Lunch" program.
> 7. Fear for childrens' safety.
>
> It was unanimously agreed that these complaints should be taken up with school authorities.[30]

The message embedded within these complaints is quite clear: blacks are hostile, dirty, undisciplined, violent, and abusers of welfare. One might also note that the lack of textbooks clearly supports the argument that the black schools were not equally supported with the white schools; if they were, the materials would simply have been transferred to the new buildings and a deficit of supplies would not have existed.

These complaints were indeed heard by the board who issued a statement on the guidelines of the lunch assistance program, and reminded the public that "the board would always act only in the best interests of all the people of Bulloch County."[31] All the people of Bulloch County, however, were not to benefit from the next policy move by the school board.

At the beginning of the second year of integration, the schools initiated ability grouping at all grade levels. The effect was to be profound in the construction of the new modality.

> Q. The institution of tracking, was that during your second year?
> I. My second year we started that.
> Q. Would you talk about that, a bit?

I. The first year we were watched closely by the courts to see if we did everything we were supposed to. The first year they would call us up on the intercom everyday and we would report to them, over the intercom, 'I have this many white girls, this many white boys, this many black girls, this many black boys.' . . . The second year, what they decided to do, and I was not in on any of the discussion; nothing was ever asked of me what I wanted as a teacher or how I felt about this, the principal came back the second year and told us, 'Here's how we've got it organized, now. We're going to have two high groups, two medium groups, and two low groups in second grade. Now we still have to keep it racially balanced because of these court orders, so what we're going to do: we're going to take the top one third white students and the top one third black students and they're going to be in the two high groups, and the same for the other groups.' So when we first started ability grouping we still had a racial balance within our classrooms.[32]

This was the beginning of the construction. The informant resigned at the end of the year due to pregnancy. Upon returning to the Bulloch school system four years later the informant stated: "It had all changed."

Q. . . . what kind of changes?
I. There was no racial balance kept at all when I went back.
Q. So there was a gradual shift, somewhere?
I. I don't know if it was gradual or not. At some point they quit watching us and at that point we started going with straight ability grouping . . .
Q. And how did that play out, that straight ability grouping?
I. That year was extremely difficult and they gave me the next to lowest group [out of six first grade levels]. What they decided was, the principal decided that since the lowest level would be the great majority of black kids, he didn't want any white kids be just one or two or three in there. So his decision was to make the lowest level all black kids and to make the highest level all white kids. And in between there would be gradually . . .
Q. When you went back, after the time away, did you notice a change in the attitude of the teachers or in the way classes were assigned?
I. Many of them [black faculty] still were, and still are, in what they call Chapter I classes, or they're teaching low levels.
Q. So the white teachers were assigned generally the upper level classes and the black teachers the lower level classes?
I. Uh huh, right.
Q. What seemed to be the attitudes of the teachers about integration; you talked about the first year when everybody was pitching in . . .
I. I think they were. When I went back I didn't see the kind of cooperative nature among teachers that I did when we first started out.
Q. Was there a separation; did they separate themselves out?
I. Pretty much. It was almost like 'This is the status quo, this is the way we are, and we just accept it.' I didn't see any cooperative effort or working together; you know, they taught their kids and we taught our kids, that kind of thing. Let me tell you this; this is interesting . . . we

played together separately. In terms of the children on the playground. Levels 'A,B,C,D,E,F' is how they labelled them, of course what's the top one - level 'A.' 'A,B,C' played on the upper playground one week while 'D,E,F' played on the lower. Now, in order to make things equitable, the next week 'D,E,F' went to the top playground and 'A,B,C' went to the bottom.
Q. What was the rationale?
I. Well, I was told that it would be easier to supervise your own group if they were on one playground, of course they were playing with two other groups at the same time, but that was the rationale. . . . They could very easily have played on both playgrounds, but they were not allowed to do that, they had to play by ability.[33]

Ability meant color. Ability grouping meant racial grouping and the policy was, in fact, unofficial and system-wide. The formation of the new modality was complete. The old modality of segregation through isolation had disappeared in the public schools and had been replaced with a more subtle and socially acceptable form of segregation: the panoptic modality of separation through assimilation.

NOTES

1. Michel Foucault, History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction trans. Hurley (New York, 1978) p. 94.

2. Ibid.

3. Michel Foucault, Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977 ed. Gordon; trans. Gordon, Marshall, Mepham, and Soper (New York, 1980) p. 142.

4. Ibid., p. 89.

5. Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison trans. Sheridan (New York, 1977) pp. 195-228.

6. Ibid., p. 200.

7. Ibid., p. 201.

8. Ibid., p. 198.

9. Ibid., p. 199.

10. Ibid., p. 207.

11. Ibid., p. 223.

12. "School designation forms to be available on Tuesday," The Bulloch Herald and the Bulloch Times (May 1, 1969) p. 1A.

13. "Trial of Justice Dept. vs County School System is June 3," Ibid. (May 22, 1969) p. 1A.

14. "Bulloch's plan for school desegregation ruled 'unacceptable'," Ibid. (June 5, 1969) p. 1A.

15. "HEW officials here today; study County school desegregation," Ibid. (July 10, 1969) p. 1A.

16. Ibid.

17. "NAACP president makes statement on schools," Ibid. (August 28, 1969) p. 1B.

18. Interview with informant "Catherine," March 21, 1991.

19. "School desegregation plan ordered at hearing Friday," op.cit. (July 24, 1969) p. 1A.

20. "Maddox stirs up hornet's nest on education front," Ibid. (July 31, 1969) p. 8C.

21. "'Citizens' adopt resolution," Ibid. (July 31, 1969) p. 8A.

22. "A Special Message From School Officials," Ibid. (August 14, 1969) pp. 1A-1C.

23. "CFBG replies to 'special message' from Co. Board," Ibid. (August 21, 1969) p. 2A.

24. "Opening of public schools postponed until Sept. 8," Ibid. (August 28, 1969) p. 1A.

25. Interview, op.cit.

26. "B.C. School Board announces changes to be effective today," op.cit. (September 10, 1969) p. 1A.

27. Interview, op.cit.

28. "Black students boycott Bulloch County schools," (August 30, 1971) p. 1A; and "Bi-racial committee raps appointments," op.cit. (September 13, 1971) p. 1A.

29. Interview, op.cit.

30. "Group votes to elect Board of Education," op.cit. (September 13, 1969) p. 1A.

31. "Board issues statement on free meals," Ibid. (November 13, 1969) p. 1C.

32. Interview, op.cit.

33. Ibid.